



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/044,296

01/10/2002

Chris D. Constantinides

56783

6836

21874

7590

08/18/2008

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP

P.O. BOX 55874

BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

CHAO, ELMER M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3737

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/18/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/044,296	Applicant(s) CONSTANTINIDES, CHRIS D.	
	Examiner ELMER CHAO	Art Unit 3737	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-25, 27 and 37-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-25, 27, and 37-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Acknowledgement is made of Applicant's amendment filed 7/23/2008.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/23/2008 has been entered.

Claim Objections

3. **Claims 40-42** are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 40-42 claim dependence from claim 37, which has been cancelled. Examiner believes claim 40 was means to claim dependence from claim 1 instead. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 7/23/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. Regarding Applicant's arguments with respect to the Judd, Berg, and Foo references, Applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to modify Judd to

include using the iron oxide contrast agents taught by Berg (page 8, paragraph 3, Arguments filed 7/23/2008). However, Examiner disagrees because contrast agents, including iron oxide contrast agents are used commonly in MRI imaging. Judd teach Berg need not teach ^{23}Na and ^{39}K MRI imaging nor does Judd need to teach using contrast agents. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that using an iron oxide contrast agent as taught by Berg would help to enhance the contrast of the selected the infarcted cardiac tissue of Judd.

6. Regarding Applicant's arguments with respect to the Judd, Berg, and Foo references, Applicant also argues that Berg does not teach or suggest manipulating the amount of contrast agent to reduce T_{2s} and/or T_{2f} values such that the signal from ventricular cavity blood and viable well-perfused tissue is reduced (page 9, paragraph 3, Arguments filed 7/23/2008). However, Examiner asserts that this modification would be obvious in view of 1) Judd's teaching of the criticality of identifying infarcted cardiac tissue with ^{23}Na or ^{39}K MRI imaging and 2) Berg's teaching of improving the contrast in MRI images by using a ferromagnetic or paramagnetic contrast agent such as an iron oxide bound to a polysaccharide (C2, L26-35).

7. Regarding Applicant's arguments with respect to the Judd, Berg, and Foo references, Applicant also argues that Judd does not teach attenuating the MRI tissue for specific regions (page 10, paragraph 2, Arguments filed 7/23/2008). However, Examiner asserts that this modification would be obvious in view of the above-mentioned teachings of Judd and Berg. Judd's established criticality of imaging infarcted cardiac tissue in combination with using Berg's contrast agent(s) would provide

enough for one of ordinary skill in the art to understand that contrast could be enhanced by attenuating the signals of the areas surrounding the infarcted cardiac tissue.

Furthermore, Foo explicitly teach the method of providing a contrast between the ventricular cavity and infarcted tissue (Para [0036]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 12-22, 24, and 37-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judd et al. (U.S. 5,910,112) in view of Lauffer et al. (U.S. 5,628,982), further in view of Berg et al. (U.S. 5,128,121), and further in view of Foo (U.S. 2002/0087067).

Regarding **claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 12-15, and 37-39**, Judd '112 teaches a method of evaluating biological tissue by imaging it with ^{23}Na or ^{39}K magnetic resonance and a magnetic resonance system for ^{23}Na or ^{39}K MRI, where the tissue is cardiac tissue, where a study is made of the subject's heart and the cardiac tissue is identified as normal, injured or infarcted, where the subject has or had a cardiac or cardiovascular disorder, and manipulating echo time (TE) so as to assist in identifying infarcted

Art Unit: 3737

myocardial tissue (C1, L15-18; C3, L32-37 & 46-53; C4, L12-30; C22, L43-67; C23, L1-23; C3, L2-5).

Judd '112 does not expressly teach the use of an iron oxide contrast agent so as to attenuate the ^{23}Na or ^{39}K MRI signal for ventricular cavity blood and viable well-perfused tissue. However, Berg '121 teaches a method of improving the contrast in MRI images by using a ferromagnetic or paramagnetic contrast agent such as an iron oxide bound to a polysaccharide (C2, L26-35) to decrease the signal level of the targeted tissue relative to its surroundings (C1, L10-38). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Judd '112 to include the use of iron oxide to attenuate the ^{23}Na or ^{39}K MRI signal for ventricular cavity blood and viable well-perfused tissue. Such a modification would enable an enhanced image contrast (C1, L10-26) so as to better distinguish viable and non-viable cardiac tissue, a criticality already established by Judd '112.

Judd '112 and Berg '121 do not expressly teach the use of the contrast before manipulating echo time. However, Laufer '982 teaches adjusting imaging parameter values after the administration of the contrast agent (C25, L45-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Judd '112 in view of Berg '121 to adjust the echo time after the administration of the contrast agent in order to accurately adjust for the diagnostic information sought (for motivation see C25, L45-60).

Judd '112, Berg '121, and Laufer '982 do not explicitly teach providing a contrast between the ventricular cavity and infarcted myocardial tissue. However, in the field of

myocardial infarction detection, Foo '067 teaches the method of providing a contrast between the ventricular cavity and infarcted tissue (Para [0036]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Judd '112, Berg '121, and Lauffer '982 to also provide contrast between the ventricular cavity and infarcted myocardial tissue in order to improve delineation of infarcted myocardium from ventricular blood pool and normal myocardium (for motivation see abstract; Para [0014]-[0015]).

Regarding **claims 16-22, 24, and 40**, Judd '112, Berg '121, Lauffer '982, and Foo '067 teach all of the limitations as discussed above. Judd '112, Berg '121, and Foo '067 do not explicitly teach manipulating the contrast agent. However Berg '121 does teach adjusting the contrast agent components and using an effective amount of the contrast agent so as to perform imaging to a particular contrast (col. 7, lines 12-46; col. 8, lines 23-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have manipulated the contrast agent to reduce or increase the contrast to distinguish various tissues and blood pools in the heart (for motivation see Judd for identifying infarcted tissue; also see Berg '121 for adjusting the contrast agent).

Regarding **claims 41 and 42**, Judd '112, Berg '121, Lauffer '982, and Foo '067 teach all of the limitations as discussed above. Judd '112, Berg '121, and Foo '067 do not explicitly teach manipulating the TE time to specifically reduce the ^{23}Na or ^{39}K MRI signals. However Judd '112 teach manipulating the TE (col. 6, line 66 – col. 7, line 27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 3737

invention to have manipulated the TE in order to reduce the ^{23}Na or ^{39}K MRI signal in ventricular cavity blood and viable well-perfused tissue (for motivation see Judd '112 col. 3, lines 46-65).

10. **Claims 8, 10-11, 23, 25, 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Judd '112 in view of Berg '121, further in view of Lauffer '982, further in view of Foo '067, further in view of Weissleder (U.S. 5,492,814). Judd '112, Berg '121, Lauffer '982, and Foo '067 teach all of the limitations as discussed above. Judd '112, Berg '121, Lauffer '982, and Foo '067 do not expressly teach the use of an iron oxide contrast agent with one or more iron atoms coordinated with a polymer having oxygen substitution, and with a dextran. However, Weissleder '814 teaches an iron oxide contrast agent for use in MRI, where the tissue imaged may be damaged heart tissue, such as infarcted myocardium, where the contrast agent has one or more iron atoms coordinated with a polymer having oxygen substitution, with a dextran and where the contrast agent is in a pharmaceutically acceptable form (C1, L16-24 & L41-55; C3, L1-11 & 28-36; C5, L7-16 & L50-63; C16, L61-67; C17, L1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the iron oxide contrast agent from Weissleder to enhance the visualization in the images of Judd '112 because the use of contrast agents in MRI to improve quality as previously shown by Berg '121, and further shown by Ranney (U.S. 5,336, 762) (C7, L48-61). Although neither Judd '112 nor Weissleder '814 nor Berg '121 nor Foo '067 specifically teach the use of MION-46, Weissleder '814 does teach the use of a variety

of MION formulas that include dextran, of which MION-46 would have been an obvious choice to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elmer Chao whose telephone number is (571)272-0674. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on (571)272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian L Casler/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3737

/E. C./

Application/Control Number: 10/044,296
Art Unit: 3737

Page 9

Examiner, Art Unit 3737
8/3/2008